DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 112 762 HE 006 758

AUTHOR Belcher, A. Lee
TITLE Labor-Management Relations in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION National Association of Coll. and Univ. Business Officers, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 70
NOTE 11p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Association of College and University Business Officers, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036
JOURNAL CIT NACUBO Professional File; Mar 1970

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Collective Bargaining; Employee Attitudes; Employer Employee Relationship; *Higher Education; *Industrial Relations; Labor Unions; *Personnel Management; Strikes; Union Members; *Unions

ABSTRACT

Labor-management relations in higher education are undergoing dramatic changes as a result of the rapidly growing unionization of personnel. A comparison of past experiences with unionization both in academe and industry reveals that administrations must determine their human resources policies and objectives before dealing with the unionization question if the question is to be dealt with effectively. There are four basic developmental phases of union-management relations that are explored in some depth: (1) the period before there are any signs of union organizing efforts or union interest among the employees; (2) the period when the rumors of union interest start circulating and handbills or other union literature begin to appear; (3) the period when a union has formally requested recognition as the collective bargaining agent for employees; (4) the period when the administration discusses and negotiates with the union and then lives with the agreements reached. Developments from outside must be recognized as impacting on colleges and universities as when federal pay scales are altered and the impact is felt throughout the labor market. (JMF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

NACUBO

MARCH 1970 PERSONNEL

PROFESSIONAL FILE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
HIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM HE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
NACUBO
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER"

ED 112 762

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

By A. LEE BELCHER
Director, Employee Relations
University of Missouri

This paper was adapted from a speech presented by Mr. Belcher at the annual meeting of the Central Association. Mr. Belcher is the author of a section on labor relations in the Handbook of College and University Administration *to be published soon by McGraw-Hill, and he is a member of the National Panel of Arbitrators and a consultant on labor relations to educational institutions, hospitals, and government agencies.*

There is a wide range of capabilities in the management of people. In discussing this subject, I would like to explore the efficient utilization of personnel in the light of recent developments and probable future trends. To be more specific, let's consider some facets of the rapidly growing unionization of personnel which, incidentally, tends to highlight the differences in managerial abilities to a greater degree than almost any other development.

Obviously, there is a very broad cross-section of interest and experience in the National Association of College and University Business Officers, ranging from those who may never have a union problem to those who have been dealing with unions for many years. Accordingly, my remarks will be "old hat" to some members, and to others it will be like reading a mystery story about some far-away land.

Comparing Notes on Experiences

If you are in the comfortable position of having no prospects of union organization on your campus, you may be interested in learning more about how your friends on other campuses are spending a great deal of their time. If you have been dealing with unions for many years, you may like to compare your past mistakes with mine and join in speculating on whether others will make the same mistakes in the future. It has been said that one learns more from his mistakes than from his successes. If this is true, I have some impressive credentials as a "learned" person. For this reason, many of the suggestions or recommendations will be based on mistakes I have made, or have observed other people make, during the past twenty-five years.

Generally speaking, we seem to learn very little from history. Educational institutions today are often found to be experimenting with the same ineffective tactics and approaches to labor-management relations that were tried by industry in the 1930's and 1940's. It has been interesting to note how closely the developments parallel each other, with about a 20-year lag. We can almost plot on a chart these parallel experiences with the same disappointing results.

Essential to a sound organization and efficient utilization of human resources are carefully thought-out policies to guide the administration at all levels. While it would be presumptuous of me to recommend specific policies to such a large group, I urge that consideration be given in advance to the position your college or university

HE 006 758

should take in regard to unionization of employees. It is vital that one recognize the importance of determining these policies and objectives *before* facing a crisis in order that careful, thoughtful consideration may be given to several basic questions and adequate advance planning may be done. For example:

Determining Policy Before a Crisis Comes

1. Does your chancellor or president prefer that the institution not have to deal with any union, or is he quite willing to negotiate with one or more unions? In my consulting work, I have found a wide range of thinking on this question. Some have no objections to bargaining with unions while others are very much against it.
2. If there is administrative acceptance of union organization of the employees, there are two additional questions which naturally follow:
   (a) Does your administration hope to limit the union activity to one union representing the non-academic employees, or is it unconcerned about how many unions may seek to represent the various groups of employees such as those in the physical plant, housing, food service, or the clerical, technical and professional staffs?
   (b) Are there certain groups of employees which the administration would not want to be unionized even though they would not resist the union's efforts to organize other groups of employees? Some institutions strongly resist the unionization of clerical, supervisory, and administrative personnel, but at the same time accept union representation of the "blue-collar" and "gray-collar" employees.
3. If the administration prefers not to negotiate with unions, it is necessary to decide to what extent one may go in an effort to defeat the union's organizing efforts. The tactics used by the administration to defeat a union can range from an indifferent, almost neutral approach to that of maximum aggressiveness in opposition, with variations at any point between these two extremes.

If one tries to straddle the fence of indecision without predetermined policies, he probably will find himself frequently putting his foot in his mouth, and in this embarrassing position he is not apt to be successful in finding solutions to the pressing problems.

Basic Phases Of The Relationship

There are four basic developmental phases of union-management relations that should be explored in some depth. Let me emphasize — and underline — that the manner of handling each phase will have a *very significant effect* on whether you will experience each succeeding phase and how well prepared you will be for coping with it.

Phase I is the period before there are any signs of union organizing efforts or union interest among the employees.

Phase II is when the rumors of union interest start circulating and handbills or other union literature are found on the parking lots or in the locker rooms.

Phase III is when a union has formally requested your institution to recognize the union as the representative of your employees for the purpose of collective bargaining.

Phase IV is when you are discussing or negotiating with the union and then living with the agreements reached in the negotiations.

I am sure you realize that any one of the four phases could be an interesting subject of an all-day seminar. I will try only to whet your appetite for more information, and if I contribute to a broader interest in the subject, I will have accomplished my objective.

•

Phase I

Let's consider Phase I, the time before there is any apparent employee interest in a union. And, for this discussion, I will assume you prefer to continue without a union although the points covered have application even if you are later bargaining with one or more unions.

It is in this phase that you can most easily qualify for membership in the One-Ten Club. To be a member you will be the one out of ten persons who is alert to possible developments: (1) You will keep abreast of those issues which cause employees to feel a union is needed to protect their interests and improve their working conditions; (2) you will

be familiar with the kinds of employee grievances which often end in arbitration, and you will know the successful arguments used by a union in support of its position; (3) you will keep informed about the manner in which unions appeal to prospective members; (4) you will read a representative number of union publications which reflect the current goals of union leaders; (5) you will keep abreast of union organizing campaigns in other colleges and universities, and (6) you will know about issues which have contributed to recent strikes on other campuses.

As a member in good standing of the One-Ten Club, you will be one in ten who will relate all of this information to your own organization. You will not assume that each supervisor or department head fully understands all of your personnel policies and the reasons for such policies. Moreover, you will not assume that there is uniformity in the interpretation of these policies, and you will take it for granted that some favoritism is being practiced in the promotions and transfers of employees, in the granting of salary increases, in the scheduling of overtime work, and in the assignment of employees to the more desirable jobs. Further, you will realize that you are so close to the situation every day that you do not always recognize these faulty practices which give the union organizer a "cause" which helps him to enroll members.

As a member of the One-Ten Club, you will want someone (often an outsider) to act as the Devil's advocate or critic, and to question certain procedures and policies. Finding weaknesses in the operations does not necessarily reflect unfavorably on your administration. The best golf pro occasionally has another pro check his swing or stance. Doctors have physical examinations. Airline pilots flying regularly are required to submit to periodical retraining and reexamination. When we live closely with the day-to-day situations, we often take it for granted that there are no festering problems and assume that we would immediately hear about them if there were any employee complaints. The One-Ten Club member knows this is not true. He accepts the fact that he probably will be one of the last to learn of poor supervisory practices, and that he often will learn of them first from a union representative. The lower levels of management are not apt to call these troublesome practices to your attention because they probably are contributing somewhat to the problems without being aware of it. Or they don't believe the grumblings by the employees are serious enough to bother you. Often they do not think there is any justification for the complaints — that only a few soreheads or trouble-makers are causing the unrest and that they will always be unhappy anyway.

An occasional check of all personnel and supervisory practices is highly essential to an effective "preventative maintenance" program. Such an "audit" should be done by probing and asking questions about the various policies and practices in such a way as to identify areas of weakness that may exist — and they almost invariably do exist. Even in the smallest institutions there often are inconsistencies in the interpretation or application of policies, or there are out-dated practices. These come to light by insightful questions as to why certain policies are being followed, or questions about possible variations in the interpretation of ambiguous language, and so on.

Employee discontent reduces productivity, and there can hardly be efficient utilization of human resources when employees are resentful and when they believe the administration has no interest in their problems. Whether or not you are concerned about the prospects of unionization, there is much to be gained in efficiency and harmony by being sensitive to these always-present managerial faults.

•

Phase II

Phase II is the time when the word begins to circulate around the physical plant, the dorms, or the cafeterias that a union representative is distributing handbills and membership cards, or that someone is quietly planning a small meeting of employees for the purpose of learning how a union may be able to help solve their problems.

If your administration has decided for philosophical or political reasons that it has no objections to recognizing and bargaining with one or more unions, I assume you would not be concerned about these rumors — that you would maintain a neutral position and let the employees decide what they wish to do. The biggest problem in this situation is in making sure that the various levels of supervision also "get the word" and remain neutral. Generally this is utopian thinking, however, and you will

need to give it some attention. Almost always you will find many foremen, supervisors, and directors who either resent all unions or feel a different union would be a better one to represent the employees. Those who have these opinions will reveal their feelings either quite openly or on a fraternal, buddy-buddy basis, frequently in devious and subtle ways which the employees clearly recognize.

If, on the other hand, your institution prefers not to bargain with any union, then the administration must decide how and to what extent you will resist the organizing efforts. There is a wide range of possible counteractions by management, with the extreme effort including actions which may not be illegal under most present state laws, but which would be unfair labor practices under the Taft-Hartley Act and the rules laid down by the National Labor Relations Board. Some states are adopting legislation that is quite similar to the Taft-Hartley Act, so you should know the legal limitations on your activities as well as your administration's overall objectives.

Actions Must Be Fair, Timely, Well-Planned

Proper action by the administration can often be effective in thwarting a union's efforts to organize the employees, providing management's actions are fair, carefully considered, timely and well-planned. But, and this is self-evident but of prime importance, such actions by the administration must be custom-tailored. There is no simple, universal, or patent medicine formula. You will want to take into consideration the nature of complaints which are serving to justify the need for a union in in the minds of the employees, the kinds of promises being made by the union organizers, and the degree to which your wage rates and fringe benefits are competitive — with those of industry and government, not with construction rates.

In industry, as well as among public employees, unions have been winning no more than 55% to 60% of the representation elections, so all is not lost when you first hear the shocking news that a union representative is on your campus. But the hour is getting late if you wish to avoid unionization, and you should take seriously the prospects of a successful union drive. Don't be overly confident and think your employees would not do such a thing to your college or university. This is when unions most often score.

One important fact which is often a surprise to many people, but which you should keep in mind if you find yourself in Phase II, is that the successful union organizing drives are usually the result of efforts by a few employees who carry on the organizing from within. Rarely can an outsider enlist enough employees by his own efforts to recruit a majority. He trains and coaches the employees who then promote the idea of a union among their fellow workers. The outside union representative is lost without the cadre of interested people soliciting membership within the college or university family.

We could devote a seminar exclusively to union organizing efforts and management's counter-strategies, but let me conclude the discussion of Phase II with these points: the experienced union organizer is a good listener; he will encourage the prospective members (usually few in number in the beginning) to tell him about "beefs" they have, or those they have heard other employees talk about; he will look for evidence of favoritism and examples of inconsistencies in the application of policies; he will be alert to any signs which can be interpreted as a threat to the future job security of the employees; he will hope to learn of employees who were discharged, seemingly without good reason or without having first been given a chance to tell their side of the story. With these case histories, the organizer will seek to demonstrate how the union can be helpful to the employees.

Just as a successful salesman feels out his prospects to determine their needs, so does an effective union representative. Once he has a clue to the needs or wishes of the prospective members, the organizer is then able to build his "sales" presentation — with promises of results in the special areas of interest to his prospects.

•

Phase III

In Phase III, the union believes it has enough members to press for recognition as the bargaining agent. The first formal move usually is when the union writes a letter to the institution claiming the union represents a majority of the employees and requests a meeting to discuss demands. In the letter, the union will request that it be recognized by the administration as the collective bargaining agent for a specific

group. This notice brings us into another specialized aspect of labor-management relations, with its many long-term implications for the administration as well as the employees.

Some colleges or universities have recognized a union by a show of union membership cards — with or without evidence of a majority of the employees being members. I don't think this practice is in the best interest of employees, the union, or the administration.

Whenever possible, I believe the wishes of the employees regarding representation by a union should be expressed in a secret ballot election and that a union should be recognized only when a majority of the employees have voted in favor of the union. Some states have laws providing the legal machinery for conducting such elections as well as laws defining unfair labor practices by management or the union during an organizing campaign. If your state has such laws, it will be highly important that you become familiar with the details and be governed accordingly. As of now, colleges and universities are not covered by the provisions of the federal labor-management legislation (such as the Taft-Hartley Act), and the National Labor Relations Board has not been willing to assert jurisdiction over union representation petitions involving employees in higher education. (There are indications, however, that this may change in the near future.)

In the absence of statutory guidelines, a decision by the institution will need to be made as to whether the union will be recognized with or without evidence of majority membership, and whether it will be determined by a "card check" or by a secret election. It goes without saying that this decision may well be made in the face of considerable pressure from the union, including the threat of a strike or when the employees are on strike.

Use of Experienced Arbitrator Suggested

If you have no state laws governing labor-management relations, it is my recommendation that you seek an agreement with the union to have an election conducted by an experienced arbitrator who would act as a neutral third party in developing the rules of procedure and supervising the election. There are several important details in connection with a representation election which should be followed in order that the outcome will not be influenced by intimidation or fraud, and so that the secrecy of the balloting will be fully safeguarded.

Under certain circumstances your administration may be willing, or feel compelled for any number of reasons, to forego an election and accept other evidence of the employees' wishes regarding union representation. The most common alternative method is one which I have already mentioned — and the one most often preferred by unions — that is, the acceptance of signed authorization cards as evidence of a majority. A number of objections to this method are often voiced by experienced labor relations men. For example, an employee may have changed his mind since signing the card, which may have occurred several months earlier. Some of the cards may have been signed under duress, false promises, or misrepresentation. Some cards may have been signed just to be socially acceptable to one's fellow workers, even though those signing may have had every intention of voting against the union in a secret ballot election. If this "card check" method is to be used, I feel it should be adopted by the administration only after an agreement has been reached that a qualified arbitrator will be asked to:

1. Confirm that the person is still an active employee.
2. Inspect the individual authorizations to determine the authenticity of signature. (In rare cases an over-eager organizer will sign the card for a prospective member, believing it is the person's desire that he do so.)
3. Determine the maximum period during which the authorizations are valid — statute of limitations.
4. Be sure that no cards are included which were signed under false promises or misrepresentation of pertinent facts.
5. Determine that the cards were not signed with the understanding by the employees that there would be an election. Often it is on this basis that employees are persuaded to sign union cards even though they are not in favor of the union representation.

The next important question in Phase III deals with the so-called bargaining unit — identifying the specific group of employees which may be represented by the union. Without becoming involved in the technical aspects in this paper, I should remind you that a decision will need to be made as to whether you will extend to the union "exclusive recognition" or whether recognition will be limited to just those employees who are members of the union. Again, as with other technical details, some state laws make provisions for "exclusive recognition," others for proportional representation, while many others are silent on this subject.

In any event, it will be necessary to clearly identify those employees who are eligible to vote and to be represented by the union. This is where the member of the One-Ten Club again demonstrates his mature understanding of labor-management relations and of the fact that you can reduce the frequency and seriousness of grievances and misunderstandings by adequate planning in the early stages of this new experience.

Reaching an understanding on the bargaining unit is often one of the more difficult points to resolve. For example, are you willing to limit the unit to just the craft employees in the physical plant and exclude the food service or custodial employees (or the reverse of this example) if this is what the union wants? It may be that the union would lose the election if all "blue-collar" employees were considered as a single bargaining unit, but would win if the election were confined to a smaller group. There are the clerical employees to consider, and still others who may be confidential secretaries to administrative officers who have access to privileged information. And what about your security force? Or the technical or professional employee? You may have a bookstore or a printing operation which should be considered as either in or out of the proposed bargaining unit. Would you want to include part-time employees? Or student workers? Finally, are you willing to include foremen or supervisors? Some unions seek to include them even though they would normally be excluded if you were governed by the rules of the National Labor Relations Board. As you can see, Phase III requires many critical decisions which should be carefully considered long before you are faced with these questions.

●

Phase IV

If developments bring you to Phase IV, that of entering into negotiations or "discussions" with the union, there will be quite a different set of facts and problems confronting you.

I can hear many of you saying you cannot legally negotiate with unions. And you are also telling me you cannot sign formal labor agreements. Perhaps you can legally only *"meet and confer"* with representatives of an employee group. Perhaps personnel policies can be drafted only in the form of resolutions which are then submitted to your Board for formal adoption. Or perhaps only your Legislature or a Civil Service Board can act on wages, fringe benefits, and certain working conditions. But don't be deluded by these differences. The end results over a period of time are apt to be much the same. While these legal restrictions must be complied with, chances are you will sooner or later be talking with the union representatives in the conventional format of negotiations about the traditional issues covered by collective bargaining — with the usual attendant pressures.

This Is the Most Important Contract

It has been said that there probably is not a more important contract ever signed by a college or university than its first union agreement — regardless of its form, whether it is a conventional union agreement or a resolution adopted by the Board. This is because of its long-term implications and its character of permanency. The scars from mistakes you make are deep and long in evidence.

The provisions of the first agreement will be with you longer than any other subsequent agreement — and chances are many of the provisions will remain substantially unchanged during the personal lifetimes of the men who first agreed to them. And despite its critical importance, management more often than not will make serious mistakes in drafting the language of the initial agreement. There are a number of reasons for these "mistakes."

1. First is the failure by management to anticipate the exceptions. Clauses in union agreements tend to be written to cover the normal, routine operations, and they are usually adequate for this purpose. But in order to operate efficiently with a

minimum of grievances during the years ahead, management must study the practical implications of the proposed language as it applies to the operations in all departments and throughout the year. An agreement that will be entirely satisfactory in July may be very troublesome during the Christmas holidays.

2. The second reason is due to management not being familiar with the generally accepted meanings attached to some words or phrases commonly used in collective bargaining. In such cases, there is not a true meeting of the minds and these honest misunderstandings can be the source of grievances and mutual distrust. (This is especially true when the union is successful in maneuvering the negotiations so that the bargaining centers around their proposed language instead of drafts prepared by management.)

   For example, if you agreed to consider seniority as well as ability for promotions, transfers and layoffs, which kind of seniority would you mean? Here are three common types:

   (a) *University seniority:* The original date of hire without a subsequent break in service.

   (b) *Departmental seniority:* The date the employee began working in the department. This may or may not be the same as the university seniority date.

   (c) *Classification seniority:* The date the employee was transferred or promoted to his present classification.

   Another example is the common pitfall when using the word "day." This can mean "calendar day" or "work day." If a grievance must be answered within five days and a weekend falls within this period, do you count Saturday and Sunday as part of the five days? If so, this means you have only three working days to investigate and consider the grievance, not five.

   I am confident that a substantial number of arbitration cases involve the application of contract language to situations which neither party anticipated. Therefore each side will try to extrapolate an interpretation of the agreement to serve its own purpose. For these reasons, and others, the drafting of agreements should not be taken lightly nor agreed upon hastily.

3. It is essential that the administration recognize from the very beginning that management's needs and the objectives of the union are at the opposite ends of the spectrum. This difference is the most fundamental of all principles in the field of labor-management relations. It may be stated simply in this way:

   Management needs maximum flexibility in managing so as to accommodate constantly changing requirements and operating demands being made upon it. On the other hand, almost every demand of a union has inherently in it some restriction or limitation on management's actions and decisions. Management wants flexibility and freedom to manage, while unions want fixed and rigid rules to govern all working conditions.

Policies Must Be Reasonable, Clear

It is for these reasons that care should be taken in considering the union's requests. Agreements should be reached only after they have been reviewed in the light of these restrictions. Of course, we realize that it is the abuse of such freedom by management which probably contributes more to employee discontent than anything else. Reasonable rules are needed. Employees have a right to know how the game will be played and that their interests will be considered along with management's needs. So, with or without a union, reasonable and clearly stated policies are essential to good employee relations.

If you reach Phase IV, there are some basic policy questions you will have to answer as a result of union requests. Two key issues will be: (1) check-off of union dues, and (2) the union shop or a modified form of union security agreement. Check-off of union dues — in the form of a payroll deduction — is often one of the foremost union demands. Most unions find they can hold their members longer and collect the dues more easily if the college or university will deduct the dues from the employee's pay check. This issue alone can be, and often is, a strike issue.

The union shop or other form of union security can be another critical issue. There are several forms of union securityand you should know the differences, not only so you can discuss the subject with your Board but also in order that you fully understand the union's demands. The *union shop agreement* requires all employees to become members of the union after a short period of employment (often 30 to 60 days). Another common form of union security is the *maintenance of membership* . This agreement requires an employee to maintain his membership in good standing as a condition of continued employment if he once joins the union. Although he is not required to join, he must always remain a member once he does join. The third form of union security is the *agency shop*. This agreement does not require any employee to become a member of the union, but requires all non-union employees to pay a "service fee" to the union equal to the normal monthly union dues. This is on the theory that the union is acting on behalf of these employees just as though they were members of the union and, therefore, they should help pay the cost of this "service."

There are often as many as forty or fifty subjects covered in the conventional union agreement. Experience has taught that these agreements tend to grow in length because new subjects and more detailed provisions are added during each succeeding negotiation. Not all of the subjects are the results of the union's demands. Some clauses are included at management's request, such as a sound "management rights" clause.

Collective bargaining in colleges and universities is different in many respects from that found in industry, although we can profit from the experience of industry over the past thirty years. One critical area of difference is in dealing with strikes, especially for the public institutions. Serious consideration should be given to finding alternative methods for resolving impasse situations so the unions will not feel a strike must be their ultimate weapon. Strikes among public employees, such as school teachers, garbage workers, (and even police and firemen) have almost reached the epidemic stage. And there are predictions by union leaders that there will be more such strikes in the future.

There are several unions actively organizing the employees of colleges and universities. Conspicuous among these unions are the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, the Laborers' International Union, the Operating Engineers, the Service Employees International Union, and the several building craft unions. With the recent successes they have enjoyed, I expect to see a significant expansion of unionization, including some "white-collar" employees and even supervisory personnel. Although the office and clerical employees in industry have been among the most difficult for unions to organize in the past, this may change. I anticipate two developments contributing to this change. First is the widespread interest in collective bargaining among teachers — either through the American Federation of Teachers or the Teachers' Associations. The teachers have contributed to making collective bargaining more socially acceptable to white-collar personnel. The second development is the rapid growth of unions among federal white-collar employees. This also tends to lend prestige and acceptance to union membership among clerical, technical, and professional staffs.

New Developments Seen for Future

Unionization of employees is not all bad. The world is not coming to an end if your employees join a union. There are ways to work with unions so as to keep the crises to a minimum even though you never eliminate excessive demands, grievances, or threats of strikes and other sanctions. Obviously, most of us would prefer to operate without a union, and with care and insight this can be done, although the trend toward unionization is certainly growing rapidly. Of far greater importance, it seems to me, is the need for handling labor-management relations on a sound basis — with an eye on the future — whichever phase you may be in. Speaking of the future, there are three probable developments which I expect will have an impact on colleges and universities in the next few years.

1. I believe the new federal coordinated wage board pay scales will affect the wage demands in a number of the institutions. These wage schedules will apply to all federal "blue-collar" employees within each broad labor market area. The rates will be established by government surveys of the going wage rates paid by major employers in the area. The pay plan provides for three wage steps for a given job grade with the employees advancing to the second rate after six months and to the

third or top rate at the end of two years. I think it would be advisable to keep informed of these wage determinations for your area.

2. Many institutions will experience more demands from the faculty for some form of bargaining. I expect the community college faculties to be especially susceptible to the concept and willing to organize as they have been already in several states. Some community colleges may have pressure from a faculty even before their maintenance and service employees become organized. Another group which has shown an active interest in collective bargaining on some university campuses is the teaching assistants, and I believe this will spread gradually to other universities. For these reasons, I would urge the business officers to be studying the causes and effects carefully. Again, "preventative maintenance" would be far more rewarding than the all-too-common practice of reacting to crises. The faculty complaints and the issues which have been negotiated and ultimately spelled out in written agreements are very different from those covering service and support personnel. It will be important for someone to keep abreast of these trends.

   Faculty groups will probably become somewhat more aggressive as a result of competition. The professional academic associations will feel the competitive pressures of the union-oriented organizations now seeking to grow and to expand their influence. This could result in the A.A.U.P. or the independent faculty associations becoming more active in their demands on the top administration of our colleges and universities, especially wherever a more militant group is found to be making progress in recruiting members among the academic staff.

   Another contributing factor to faculty interest in collective bargaining will be the mounting competition for sharing in the available financial resources. With the increasing needs rapidly outgrowing the ability to provide funds for every purpose, we should expect faculty concern over how the resources will be allocated.

3. The third probable development will be found in more states passing laws governing collective bargaining. These laws will tend to resemble the federal regulations. It will be helpful to keep informed on the federal policies including the President's Executive Order 11491, which sets forth the policies and procedures for union recognition and collective bargaining among federal civil service and wage board personnel. And if the National Labor Relations Board alters its long-standing policy by asserting jurisdiction of higher education, as it well may, this will be of prime importance.

With the continuing inflation, rapidly rising wage rates, and more costly fringe benefits, efficient utilization of human resources will become an ever more pressing need. While increased productivity in mass production industries has in the past offset in part the ever-increasing wage rates, the service industries (including colleges and universities) have not been able to automate enough to absorb any significant portion of the higher wages and salaries. And I don't expect that there will be a great amount of future automation in many of our campus jobs in the near future. This will mean a real need for better organization and better planning, improved communications, greater cooperation between departments and less tolerance with mediocrity. All of which suggests we will need a high level of mature, professional competence in all key positions of college and university administration. And I hope you will forgive my prejudice when I stress that this applies especially to the management of the human resources of our institutions.

For additional readings, see Page 10.

ADDITIONAL READINGS

Doherty, Robert E., *Industrial and Labor Relations Terms: A Glossary*, Ithaca, New York: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, 1961.

Ferguson, Tracy H., "Collective Bargaining in Universities and Colleges," *Labor Law Journal*, December 1968, 19:778-804.

Fritz, Richard J., *Management Electioneering Guide*, 4th edition, Detroit: Management Labor Relations Service, 1969.

McHugh, William F., "Collective Negotiations in Public Higher Education," *College & University Business*, December 1969, 47:41-44, 61-62.

Smith, Ray F., Jr., "When the Union Organizer Knocks on Your Door," *Journal of the CUPA*, February 1968, 19:1-8.

Guidelines to Victory: A Handbook on Successful Management Strategy and Tactics in Countering Union Organization Drives, Jenkintown, Pennsylvania: American Association of Industrial Management, 1966.

March 27, 1970